

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT PETITION NO : 8806 of 1996

Date: 30.08.2005

Between:

B. Kotaiah, S/o. Ramaiah,
R/o. Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

Salar Jung Museum Board, Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad
rep. by its Director-cum-Secretary.

.....RESPONDENT

ORDER:

-

In this writ petition, Memo dated 16.04.1996, issued by the Director-cum-Secretary of Salar Jung Museum, is impugned, whereby, the petitioner was informed that the Department of Culture, Government of India, Ministry of Human Resources Development, had not agreed for granting additional charge allowance under FR-49 in respect of Sri B.Kotaiah, the petitioner herein, and that the over-payment on account of additional charge allowance paid beyond the period of three months i.e., from 15.03.1993 to 30.04.1995 had been worked out at Rs.10,298/-. The petitioner was further informed that the annual increment in the substantive post (Dy.Keeper) due on 01.10.1993, 01.10.1994 and 01.10.1995 had already been sanctioned and that the basic pay with effect from 01.10.1995 stood at Rs.3,900/ per month. The petitioner was informed that the arrears on account of the increments had been set off against the over-payment made on account of additional charge allowances and still an amount of Rs.10,298/- was to be recovered from him. The petitioner was asked to arrange the remittance of the above amounts to the Office of the Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad.

On the writ petition being filed, this Court, by order dated 24.04.1996 granted interim directions to recover the amount of Rs.10,298/- in instalments equivalent to the amount at which they were paid per month to the petitioner.

Sri K. Durga Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner had retired from service on 30.06.1997.

In view of the order passed by this Court on 24.04.1996 directing the respondents to recover the amount of Rs.10,298/- in instalments, the impugned order dated 16.04.1996 has worked itself out and the cause of the writ petition does not survive adjudication.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as infructuous. No order as to costs.

Ramesh Ranganathan, J

Date: 30.08.2005

va